

**PATENT****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of: Wen-Chi FANG

Serial No.: 09/995,423

Group No.: 2816

Filed: November 27, 2001

Examiner: H. Nguyen

For: UNIVERSAL CLOCK GENERATOR

Attorney Docket No.: U 013738-6

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAR 18 2004

**OFFICIAL**ATTENTION: TIMOTHY P. CALLAHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**REQUEST FOR NEW ACTION**

The Action of December 31, 2004, rejects claims 1, 3, 4 and 15 under 35 USC 103 for obviousness from the previously cited Miyazaki, et al. US Patent 6,515,519 and the newly cited Tsern, et al. US Patent 6,263,448.

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8a)**

---

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

**MAILING**

- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**FACSIMILE**

- ☒ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office to (703) 872-9306

Date: March 18, 2004  
SignatureWilliam R. Evans


(Type or print name of person certifying)

For this, the Action indicates, for example, "... Miyazaki et al. discloses in Figs. 1-4 a clock generator circuit comprising only one high frequency clock region (10, 12, 14, 16) ...." However, while reference character 12 appears in Fig. 1 of the patent, the other reference characters 10, 14, 16 do not appear in Figs. 1-4 at all. Further, reference character 12 in the patent is a clock signal as described a column 5, line 29, and not a high frequency clock region as indicated in the Action. Furthermore, the clock signal 12 in Fig. 1 of the Miyazaki, et al. patent is one of at least three and possibly six such "clocks," whereby it cannot possibly be the only one high frequency clock region alleged in the Action.

There are other such inconsistencies between the Action and the art.

Therefore, it is too difficult for the Applicant to respond to the Action by trying to guess what was intended. For example, attention could be directed to US Patent 5,345,449. However, it is the duty of the Patent Office to state the basis of a rejection clearly and not the duty of the Applicant to guess at the basis.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William R. Evans  
c/o Ladas & Parry  
26 West 61<sup>st</sup> Street  
New York, New York  
Reg. No. 25858  
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930